

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on June 30, 2004. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-20, 22-38, and 40-54 have been previously presented. Claims 21 and 39 have been canceled. New claims 55-62 have been added. Note that claim 1 has been amended for only editorial reasons, i.e., to put the claim in proper step language. No new issues are raised by the amendment of claim 1.

The Examiner objected to the Abstract for not being a single paragraph, and for using "means" language. A new paragraph has been provided, making the objection moot.

Claim 49 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for unclear language. The claim has been amended, making the rejection moot.

Claims 1-13, 15, 17-47, and 50-54 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Geisler *et al.* (U.S. 6,252,989). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a method of "transmitting first image data with a low resolution over a first transmission channel" and "transmitting second image data corresponding to the image areas viewed currently, or in future, by said at least one user, said transmitting second image data being transmitted with a higher resolution over a second transmission channel."

Similarly, claim 55 recites a method of "transmitting first image data over a first transmission channel" and "transmitting second image

data over a second transmission channel, said second image data having a higher resolution than said first image data".

Claim 56 recites similar limitations to those above. Claims 58, 61, and 62 all recite a first transmission channel for transmitting first image data, and a second transmission channel for transmitting second image data at a higher resolution.

At the personal interview, it was pointed out to the Examiner that Geisler teaches only a single communications channel for transmitting an image (See Fig. 1 and accompanying text). There is no teaching in the reference that first image data is sent via a first transmission channel, and that second image data at a higher resolution is sent via a second transmission channel. The Examiner agreed at the interview that the reference used only a single transmission channel. Thus, claims 1, 55, 56, 58, 61, and 62 are all patentable over the reference. The remaining rejected claims, all of which depend, directly or indirectly, on one of claims 1, 55, 56, 58, 61, and 62, are thus also patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34415.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48540

1801 East 9th Street, Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700
Date: July 19, 2004